



Mitchell, D., Allen, M. R., Hall, J. W., Muller, B., Rajamani, L., & Le Quéré, C. (2018). The myriad challenges of the Paris Agreement. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 376(2119), [20180066].
<https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2018.0066>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1098/rsta.2018.0066](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2018.0066)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via The Royal Society at <http://rsta.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/376/2119/20180066>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

The Myriad Challenges of the Paris Agreement

Dann Mitchell¹, Myles Allen², Jim Hall², Benito Muller², Lavanya Rajamani³, Corinne Le Quéré⁴

¹*School of Geographical Sciences, University of Bristol, UK*

²*Environmental Change Institute, University of Oxford, UK*

³*Centre for Policy Research, India*

⁴*Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, University of East Anglia, UK*

The much awaited and intensely negotiated Paris Agreement was adopted on the 12th of December 2015 by the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC, 2015). The agreement set out a more ambitious long term temperature goal than many had anticipated, implying more stringent emissions reductions that have been under-explored by the research community. By its very nature a multidisciplinary challenge, filling the knowledge gap requires climate scientists, the Earth system science community, as well as economists, engineers, lawyers, philosophers, politicians, emergency planners and others to step up. To kick start cross-disciplinary discussions, the University of Oxford's Environmental Change Institute (ECI) focused its 25th anniversary conference upon meeting the challenges of the Paris Agreement for science and society. This Special Issue consists of review papers, opinion pieces and original research from some of the presentations within that meeting, covering a wide range of issues underpinning the Paris Agreement.

What are the Paris Agreement goals?

Article 2 of the Paris Agreement identifies its purpose as:

1. Holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, recognizing that this would significantly reduce the risks and impacts of climate change.
2. Increasing the ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change and foster climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development, in a manner that does not threaten food production.
3. Making finance flows consistent with a pathway towards low greenhouse gas emissions and climate-resilient development.

In their contribution to this special issue, [Rajamani and Werksman, 2018](#), analyze the legal character of the long term temperature goal contained in Article 2 (UNFCCC) in the context of the overall framework of the Paris Agreement. They argue that although this goal has an operational role in infusing global and national discourse on climate policy with greater ambition

and urgency, it does not have specific legal force in relation to the actions of individual Parties. Parties may have chosen to circumscribe the legal force of the long-term temperature goal, in part, over concerns about its feasibility.

How feasible are the Paris Agreement goals?

Fossil fuels provide energy for many of our most fundamental technologies. [Miller and Friedlingstein, 2018](#) suggest that due to the substantial uncertainty in net radiative anthropogenic forcing on the climate system, uncertainty in observational constraints on the transient climate response to cumulative emissions (the prime uncertainty in remaining carbon budgets) remains large. They provide a best estimate of of 920 GtCO₂ (250 GtC) for the remaining carbon budget to give a 50% probability of temperatures remaining below 1.5°C based on historical constraints, but highlight a number of reasons for caution in extrapolating carbon budgets from historical data alone. Using potential future scenarios, [Lowe and Bernie, 2018](#) found that current estimates of the remaining carbon budget may well be too large, and the remaining budget might be less than estimated. Their analysis is based on an assessment of including additional Earth system processes that are thought to be important for the carbon budget analyses, which range from the release of methane from wetlands, to the more uncertain contribution of fire to the carbon budget.

The analysis from [Kriegler et al, 2018](#) suggests that it may only be possible to limit our global temperature increases to below 1.5°C without a global mean temperature overshoot, if the remaining carbon budget is of the order 800GtCO₂, and only if emission reductions begin immediately. A simple consequence of the cumulative impact of CO₂ emissions on global temperature is that, for every year of delay, as emissions continue at a constant rate, the time available for the transition to net zero emissions to limit warming to any given level shortens by two years. Millar and Friedlingstein 2018 suggest that 800GtCO₂ is well within the range consistent with the historical record, but even limiting future cumulative emissions to this amount gives at best approximately even odds of limiting warming to 1.5°C, highlighting the need for robust or precautionary response strategies to hedge against the possibility of a higher climate response. If the budget is smaller, an overshoot is inevitable, even when assuming very strong energy demand and fossil fuel emission reduction initiatives. Either way, a crucial step in stabilising climate at any level is to balance the anthropogenic sources and sinks, thereby reducing net carbon dioxide emissions to zero. [Fuglestedt et al., 2018](#) point out that this 'balance', as formulated in the text of the Paris Agreement, is not well defined, and that the interpretation can influence how global temperature evolves over time. They study possible interpretations, their implications and discuss how clarifications are needed to make the concept of 'balance' operational for climate policies.

In our fossil fuel dependent society, the task of emission reduction can seem somewhat abstract, and [Eyre et al, 2018](#) argue that transition to a system that can fully replace fossil fuels will require social and technical change, and thus both parts of this problem should be addressed in conjunction. Furthermore, [Gomez-Echeverri, 2018](#) argue that intertwining the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with the Paris agenda is the most natural and efficient

method to reduce carbon emissions, but that governance and institutions will pose major challenges for policy and decision makers. Ethiopia is offered as an exemplar as it addresses both climate and development challenges, with changes to agricultural practices, replanting forests and introducing low-carbon technologies for its infrastructure. The Paris Agreement takes a hybrid approach - combining bottom up nationally determined contributions from countries with a top down oversight system that seeks to ensure that countries follow through on the contributions that they voluntarily assume. The emphasis on self-selected national contributions enables countries like Ethiopia to put forward initiatives and innovations tailored to national circumstances that assist it in advancing both climate and development goals. .

One way to further reduce net carbon emissions is through so called negative emissions technologies, and carbon capture and storage. Some of these techniques have already been prototyped. [Hazeldine et al, 2018](#) note the emergence of relatively low-cost technologies, few of which are commercially viable at the moment: although in the absence of an active market for CO₂ removal, it is difficult to assess what commercial viability means. They argue that to make these viable there needs to be political commitment to a carbon price that is sufficiently high to provide the incentive to deploy negative emissions technologies at scale.

Geo-engineering offers a more controversial instrument for achieving the goals of the Paris Agreement. [MacMartin et al, 2018](#), amongst others, argue that direct injection of sulphate aerosol into the stratosphere is considered the most plausible geoengineering method, employing physical science and technological arguments. They show that a 1.5°C climate that employs some form of geoengineering would not be the same as a 1.5°C climate that was stabilised through emissions reductions and negative emission technologies alone. However, these two climates would be substantially closer to each other than either is to a 3°C world untouched by geoengineering. Nonetheless, geoengineering is fraught with environmental and geopolitical risks. [Frumhoff and Stephens, 2018](#) argue that early and continuous engagement regarding the underpinning science of geoengineering, especially in terms of the Earth system response to it, should be initiated with politicians, and even more so with the wider society. They argue that this should take priority over field research on geoengineering, so that any such technologies are not deployed before they gain public legitimacy.

What are the tradeoffs for stabilising climate at 1.5C and 2C?

Small island states were amongst the principal proponents of 1.5°C temperature goal in the Paris Agreement, recognizing the importance of curtailing global warming to limit sea level rising and engulfing large portions of their islands. Unfortunately, [Nicholls et al, 2018](#) show that sea level rise will inevitably continue after stabilization of global mean temperatures, so it will only be slowed by stabilizing climate at 1.5°C. They show that sea level rise in 2300 under the Paris Agreement goals will exceed unmitigated sea level rise in 2100. Crucially, however, the 1.5°C stabilisation leaves time for small island states and coastal cities to adapt. They also show that under the Paris Agreement goals, ocean pH and temperature will stabilise within the century, benefiting vulnerable ecosystems such as coral reefs.

Other authors have considered further Earth system impacts. For instance, [Seneviratne et al, 2018](#) show a substantial change in regional temperature and water cycle extremes over densely populated regions of the world when climate is stabilised at 1.5°C compared with 2°C, with much of this change coming from land use forcing, and soil moisture feedbacks. The temperature extremes in particular were amplified in dry-to-wet transition regions. [Betts et al, 2018](#) find similar results for temperature extremes, and further added that stabilisation at 2°C would lead to higher flood risk, and lower river flows during droughts, compared to stabilization at 1.5°C, highlighting the importance of changes in both tails of the river flow distribution. These changes have clear knock on effects for biodiversity in regions all over the globe, and [Smith et al, 2018](#) show that stabilising climate at a levels of 1.5°C would avoid 50% of species losing 50% of their climatic range relative to stabilization at 2°C. They emphasize that when referring to the 1.5°C temperature level, the UNFCCC states that “[this] level should be achieved within a timeframe sufficient to allow ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change”, and therefore, like [Gomez-Echeverri, 2018](#), argue for careful integration with the SDGs to achieve this.

It is critical to understand impacts avoided on Earth system components as well the impact sectors they feed through to. [Rosenzweig et al, 2018](#) demonstrate that the global agricultural picture is complex in this regard, but that some breadbaskets would see a decline in productivity, more so for the 2°C scenario than the 1.5°C scenario, with clear onward price implications for agricultural commodities.

Performing a broader sweep of global economics (i.e. beyond agricultural finances) using empirical estimates, [Pretis et al, 2018](#) find economic growth in general would be similar between the present day and a 1.5°C warmer world, but would be significantly lower for a large set of countries in a 2°C world compared with present day. Although they emphasise high uncertainties around both economic and climate projections, they show that economic inequality across countries is likely increased under 2°C as compared with present day. [Klinsky and Winkler, 2018](#) also note that inequality will likely be higher than present day under the Paris climate goals, and they note that more needs to be done to include inequality arguments into integrated assessment models, as only then can a thorough evaluation of inequality and climate change occur. It is through this understanding of inequality that Loss and Damage plays a critical role. [Verchick et al, 2018](#) argue that even the half a degree difference between the Paris temperature goals should be enough to require adequate future plans to be put in place to help the most vulnerable.

What we have learned

Evidence suggests whilst reductions in greenhouse gas emissions play an essential role in stabilisation of climate at 1.5°C, it is looking ever more unlikely that emission reductions alone will be sufficient, so they will likely need to be supplemented by large-scale carbon dioxide removal if a commitment to permanent albedo geo-engineering, with all its concomitant governance challenges and geopolitical hazards, is to be avoided. Whilst the necessary “negative emission technologies” already exist, their implementation globally will be enormously challenging, requiring policy incentives and industrial mobilization on a far greater scale than is currently evident. [Shue, 2018](#) notes that in many regions of the world use of fossil fuels is

reducing. Increasingly, low, zero and negative carbon technological developments are gaining momentum. But Shue stresses that strong policy measures are still essential to share the burden of inequality. Very significant changes are already underway following the Paris Agreement. The papers in this Issue demonstrate that, on the balance of probability, limiting warming to 1.5°C, in the context of sustainable and equitable development, is still possible. It remains to be seen whether the evidence provided on the impacts of climate change avoided by stabilising at 1.5°C over higher temperature thresholds will be sufficient to motivate action on the scale and pace needed to achieve the 1.5°C goal.

References

UNFCCC. 29 January 2016 Decision 1/CP.21 Adoption of the Paris Agreement.
FCCC/CP/2015/10 Add.1, Annex (Paris Agreement).

All other references are from this special issue.